UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD REGION 10

DONALD EDWIN BUSSEY III, AN INDIVIDUAL) SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC)	SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC	
SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC and Case 10-CA-199732 LASHOAN THOMAS, AN INDIVIDUAL SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC and Case 10-CA-201235 INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF	and)	Case 10-CA-199183
and) Case 10-CA-199732 LASHOAN THOMAS, AN INDIVIDUAL) SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC) and) Case 10-CA-201235 INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED) AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND) AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF)	DONALD EDWIN BUSSEY III, AN INDIVIDUAL	
LASHOAN THOMAS, AN INDIVIDUAL SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC and Case 10-CA-201235 INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF	SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC	
SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC and Case 10-CA-201235 INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF	and)	Case 10-CA-199732
and) Case 10-CA-201235) INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED) AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND) AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF)	LASHOAN THOMAS, AN INDIVIDUAL	
INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF)	SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC	
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKS OF)	and)	Case 10-CA-201235
AMERICA (UAW) REGION 8	AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND	
	AMERICA (UAW) REGION 8	

RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO COUNSEL FOR THE GENERAL COUNSEL'S OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS

Schnellecke Logistics Alabama, LLC ("Schnellecke" or "Respondent") replies¹ as follows to Counsel for the General Counsel's ("CGC") Opposition to Schnellecke's November 13, 2017 Motion to Stay Proceedings pending resolution of its challenge to National Labor Relation Board Administrative Law Judges' Constitutional authority:

1. CGC's Opposition claims Respondent's Motion to Stay ("Motion") was "improperly filed" with the National Labor Relations Board ("Board") and not with the Chief Administrative Law Judge as required under § 102.24 of the Board's Rules and Regulations (see

¹ Schnellecke's reply is filed pursuant to §102.24 (c) of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

CGC's Opp., pp. 2-3) but the Opposition ignores that under the same section the Board may "postpone[] indefinitely" a hearing. Respondent's Motion (which was filed in conjunction with a dispositive motion to dismiss filed with the Board) simply requested that the Board exercise its authority under § 102.24 to postpone indefinitely the hearing, certainly a proper exercise of the Board's authority. CGC's contention that Respondent cannot ask the Board to do what it is expressly permitted to do is wrong. Regardless, if Respondent's Motion was improperly filed (*it was not*²) the same justifications for postponement remain, and the Board should stay the proceedings pursuant to §102.24 of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

- 2. CGC's Opposition claims that the Board should not postpone the scheduled hearing because it did not postpone the hearing in WestRock Services, Inc., Case No. 10-CA-195617 where the employer also challenged the Administrative Law Judge's ("ALJ") Constitutional authority (see CGC's Opp., pp. 3-4), but the Opposition ignores that (1) the motion to dismiss in that case was filed just days before the hearing whereas, here, the motion to stay was filed over twenty-one days before the scheduled hearing and (2) the employer did not ask for a stay. Just as importantly, simply citing to WestRock Services, Inc. is unpersuasive as CGC provides no substantive argument, explanation or critical analysis addressing why this case should not be stayed; CGC fails to address that if Respondent's motion to dismiss is successful the appointed ALJ will lack authority to hear this case and a hearing would be improper and a waste of time and resources. Resolution of the motion to dismiss is necessary prior to proceeding with a hearing in this matter.
- 3. CGC's Opposition argues a stay would frustrate the remedial purposes of the Act (see CGC's Opp., pp. 4-5) yet cites no supporting authority. Instead, CGC contends that a stay is

 $^{^2}$ In an abundance of caution, Respondent also filed a Motion to Stay with the Chief Administrative Law Judge.

not proper because Section 10(j) of the National Labor Relations Act permits interim injunctive relief and, here, authorization to seek such interim relief has been requested to the Board (but that request is still pending). (Id.). CGC's position is difficult to understand. The availability of 10(j) relief under appropriate circumstances is the reason cases should <u>not</u> be expedited *sua sponte* by Regional Directors (otherwise Regional Directors can circumvent 10(j)'s procedural safeguards).

4. CGC's final argument is that any appointment defects can be cured (see CGC's Opp., p. 6), but this fallback argument only underscores that there is a problem here. Such "ratification" has not yet happened and the cases cited by CGC are all premised on invalid appointments that had *already* been ratified and are not persuasive here. Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. Gordon, 819 F.3d 1179, 1190–91 (9th Cir. 2016), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 2291 (2017) ("The subsequent valid appointment, coupled with Cordray's August 30, 2013 ratification. . ."); Advanced Disposal Servs. E., Inc. v. N.L.R.B., 820 F.3d 592 (3d Cir. 2016) ("Board's *nunc pro tunc* ratification of all administrative, personnel, and procurement matters approved by Board or taken by or on behalf of Board when Board had lacked a quorum, Board's express ratification of appointment of Regional Director, and Regional Director's ratification of all actions he had taken during that period. . .); Fed. Election Comm'n v. Legi-Tech, Inc., 75 F.3d 704, 708 (D.C. Cir. 1996) ("Here, as the FEC points out, the constitutional violation, *which obliged us to dismiss the case in NRA*, has been remedied—or at least the FEC purported to remedy the defect.").³

WHEREFORE, Schnellecke asks that its Motion to Stay be granted.

³ <u>Doolin Sec. Sav. Bank, F.S.B. v. Office of Thrift Supervision</u>, 139 F.3d 203 (D.C. Cir. 1998) has been superseded by Statute as Stated in <u>Wilkes-Barre Hospital Company, LLC v. National Labor Relations Board</u>, D.C. Cir., May 19, 2017.

/s/ Marcel L. Debruge_

Marcel L. Debruge Michael L. Lucas Meryl L. Cowan

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT SCHNELLECKE LOGISTICS ALABAMA, LLC

OF COUNSEL:

BURR & FORMAN LLP 420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400 Birmingham, Alabama 35203 Telephone: (205) 251-3000 Facsimile: (205) 458-5100

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed and a copy sent to the following via e-mail and/or U.S. Mail, on this the 27th day of November, 2017:

John D. Doyle, Jr. (via email) Regional Director National Labor Relations Board Region 10 233 Peachtree NE Harris Tower, Suite 1000 Atlanta, GA 30303-1504 Email: john.doyle@nlrb.gov

Joe Webb (via email)
National Labor Relations Board
1130 South 22nd Street
Suite 3400
Birmingham, AL 35205-2870
Email: Joseph.Webb@nlrb.gov

Donald Edwin Bussey, III (via email and U.S. Mail) 4208 Autumn Lane Vestavia, AL 35243 Email: busseyd3@gmail.com

Lashoan Thomas (via email and U.S. Mail) 2703 Harrison Taylor Circle, Apt. B Tuscaloosa, AL 35401 Email: Thomas.lashoan@gmail.com

International Union, United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW) (via mail) Region 8 3922 Volunteer Drive, Suite 7 Chattanooga, TN 37416 Email: morourke@uaw.net

George N. Davies Quinn, Connor, Weaver, Davies & Rouco LLP Two North Twentieth 2 – 20th Street North Suite 930 Birmingham, AL 35203 Email: gdavies@QCWDR.com

Marcel L. Debruge_

OF COUNSEL